

### **REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the first Office Action. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. Claims 1-20 are currently pending and stand rejected. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicants have responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

#### **Specification Objection**

The Examiner objects to the title. Applicants have amended the title in response to the Examiner's comments. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of the objection to the title.

#### **Drawing Objection**

The Examiner objects to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Applicants file with this Response formal drawings to replace the original drawings in order to place the drawings in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of the objection to the drawings.

#### **Section 102 Rejection**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,815,665 issued to Teper et al. ("*Teper*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Teper* fails to disclose, or even teach or suggest, the elements specifically recited in Applicants' claims. For example, *Teper* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the following elements recited in amended independent Claim 1:

receiving, from the user system, a user-specified search value of a search variable directed to a feature of the services;  
querying the directory of the plurality of services according to the search value.

The Examiner points to the passage of *Teper* at Col. 3, Line 65-Col. 4, Line 5 as teaching these elements. (Office Action, page 4.) The passage discloses customization data to customize services:

The Online Brokering Service also preferably stores, and dynamically provides to the SP sites upon user authentication, user-specific customization data which may be used by the Service Providers to customize their respective services to individual users. This customization information may include, for example, (1) user-specified preferences for the display of certain types of data, (2) the geographic region (e.g., zip code) in which the user resides, ... .

(*Teper*, Col. 3, Line 65-Col. 4, Line 5). That is, the passage merely discloses user-customization data used to customize services, but not a search value used to perform a search query. Consequently, *Teper* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “receiving, from the user system, a user-specified search value of a search variable directed to a feature of the services,” much less “querying the directory of the plurality of services according to the search value” of Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, independent Claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102. For analogous reasons, independent Claims 7, 13, 19, and 20 and their respective dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-20.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-0765 of Electronic Data Systems Corporation.

Respectfully submitted,  
Baker Botts L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants



Keiko Ichiye  
Reg. No. 45,460  
(214) 953-6494

Date: 12/10/08

Correspondence Address:  
at Customer No.

**35005**